

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated September 11, 2007, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-25 and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicants have provided herein a replacement abstract. The changes to the abstract include minor editorial and clarifying changes. No new matter has been added by the changes made to the abstract.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that the present title fails to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Additionally, the Examiner suggested the following new title: "METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR EXTENDING COVERAGE OF WLAN ACCESSPOINT VIA OPTICALLY MULTIPLEXED CONNECTION OF ACCESS POINT TO EXTENSION STATIONS." The Applicants have amended the title as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to the Applicants' priority claim. The Examiner alleged that the Applicants' priority claim does not comply with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filed application under 35 USC 120.

The Applicants respectfully point out that the claim for priority in the present application is made under 35 USC 119, not 35 USC 120. In other words, the Applicants have made a claim for foreign priority, not domestic priority. The Applicants claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119 has been acknowledged on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action.

At present, U.S. patent law does not require amending the specification to include a reference to a foreign application when claiming the benefit of foreign priority under 35 USC 119. The requirement to amend the specification (as suggested by the Examiner) is only necessary when claiming the benefit of domestic priority under 35 USC 120. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Applicants' priority claim is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner made a double patenting rejection to claims 2 and 3 of

the present application. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that claim 3 is a substantial duplicate of claim 2.

However, the Applicants respectfully point out that under U.S. patent law, a double patenting rejection is correctly applied between claims in two different applications, or between claims in an application and an issued U.S. patent. In the present case, the Examiner has inappropriately applied a double patenting rejection to claims of the same application.

However, it is assumed that the Examiner meant to reject claims 2 and 3 as being duplicate claims. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claim 3 to differentiate the scope of the claim with respect to claim 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 2 and 3 as duplicate claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 7-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Schwartz et al. (U.S. 6,801,767, hereafter “Schwartz”).

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 28 to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art. Specifically, claim 1, in relevant part, recites the following:

“A wireless access system using Carrier Sense Multiple Access for Media Access Control of a host device using a plurality of terminals, the wireless access system comprising:

...an access control section for transmitting the downstream optical signal received from the master station to the plurality of slave stations via the optical fiber transmission line, transmitting the upstream optical signal transmitted from the any one of the plurality of slave stations to the master station via the optical fiber transmission line, and notifying all other slave stations of the plurality of slave stations that the any one of the plurality of slave stations has transmitted the upstream optical signal.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 28. Specifically, claim 28 is a corresponding method having steps performed by the access control section of claim 1. These features of independent claims 1 and 28 are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see, e.g., Fig 1); and are not believed to be disclosed by the cited prior art.

Schwartz discloses a system for distributing multiband wireless communication signals.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on col. 5, lines 30-35 of Schwartz for disclosing the access control section or method of the present invention. However, col. 5, lines 30-35 merely discloses the use of an RF switch coupled to a downlink power-detecting means that is actuated according to the power level of the downlink RF signals in the TDD frequency band. Nothing in col. 5, lines 30-35 of Schwartz discloses transmitting an upstream optical signal transmitted from the any one of a plurality of slave stations to the master station via the optical fiber transmission line, and notifying all other slave stations of the plurality of slave stations that the any one of the plurality of slave stations has transmitted the upstream optical signal, as in claims 1 and 28.

Additionally, the system in Schwartz does not appear to address a hidden terminal problem. That is, a situation in which signal collisions occur between multiple terminals requesting access to data, thereby degrading data transmission in a communications network. This hidden terminal problem is addressed by the access control section and method recited respectively in claims 1 and 28.

Specifically, in the present invention of claims 1 and 28, a master station and slave stations are connected through an optical multiplexing/demultiplexing section. The multiplexing/demultiplexing section coordinates packets transmission so that only one terminal can access the access point at a time. This makes it possible to provide wireless LAN services over a wide area with one access point, and also prevents degradation in transmission performance due to the hidden terminal problem.

Therefore, Schwartz fails to disclose or suggest at least all the features of the claimed access control section and method recited respectively in claims 1 and 28 (as amended). Based on the foregoing, claims 1 and 28 are not anticipated by Schwartz. Likewise, dependent claims 2-4 and 7-27 are not anticipated by Schwartz based at least on their dependency from independent claims 1 and 28, respectively.

In the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz in view of Chen et al. (U.S. 7,177, 294, hereafter "Chen").

Claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1. As noted above, Schwartz fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1 (as amended). Additionally, Chen fails to

overcome the deficiencies noted above in Schwartz. Therefore, Schwartz in view of Chen fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1, from which claims 5 and 6 depend. Therefore, no obvious modification to or combination of Schwartz in view of Chen would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention recited in depend claims 5 and 6.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections and rejections presented in the Office Action dated September 11, 2007, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsutomu NIIHO et al.

By:



Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP(JRF)/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 7, 2007